

Date: Thu, 31 Mar 94 04:30:08 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #155
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 31 Mar 94 Volume 94 : Issue 155

Today's Topics:

 Amateur Radio current callsigns
Form 610 and the FCC's attitude toward code (was: Rich has flipped..)
 Incentive Licensing (4 msgs)
 Incentive Licensing (
 Morse Whiners (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 30 Mar 1994 14:52:42 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!lerc.nasa.gov!magnus.acs.ohio-
state.edu!cis.ohio-state.edu!pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu!austin.onu.edu!
droberts@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Amateur Radio current callsigns
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Lo.. If I were to take my General class test today, approximately what would
my callsign turn out to be? Does anyone know where to find this sort of
info? I thought I saw it in QST once, but haven't been able to find it
in the recent copy.

Anyone help? N8XXW

--

Daniel D. Roberts
droberts@austin.onu.edu

Ohio Northern University
PO Box 34, Ada, Ohio 45810

Ack! ___/|
 \0.o|

Rubber duckie, you're the one...

73 de N8XXW

=(___)=
 U

Date: 29 Mar 1994 17:35:32 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!
charnel.net.csuchico.edu!charnel!olivea!korie1!news2me.EBay.Sun.COM!
exodus.Eng.Sun.COM!engnews2.Eng.Sun.COM!engnews2!rfm@network.
Subject: Form 610 and the FCC's attitude toward code (was: Rich has flipped..)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <28MAR199417340477@rosie.uh.edu> st3qi@rosie.uh.edu (Killebrew, Brad A.) writes:

>In article <032894004025Rnf0.77b8@amcomp.com>, dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes...

>>[the code requirement is imposed by]

>>Not the FCC. The HAMS! The FCC wants to drop the code tests (IMHO).

>

>I beg to differ. Read the back of a current Form 610.

I have. It says, quoting from memory so I may not have it word perfect, "code proficiency is a skill which the *amateur radio community* strongly wishes to preserve, and the Commission supports them in this."
(my emphasis.)

I.e. the FCC is happy as long as we're happy. If the FCC thought that most vocal hams wanted to drop the requirement, they'd drop it in a minute. My opinion is different from Dan's in that I think the FCC just doesn't care now -- they don't have to administer the tests, after all, so there's not even a significant cost saving. Back a few years, it seemed that at least one of the Commissioners had actually focused on the issue and was pushing a bit for a no-code license, but now that we have the no-code Tech that's gone (also we've had significant turnover in the Commission, what with the change of administration.)

Rich

--

Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

Date: Tue, 29 Mar 1994 16:32:13 GMT
From: sgiblab!brunix!pstc3!md@ames.arpa
Subject: Incentive Licensing
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Troyce-290394082614@idmb-secretary.tamu.edu>,
Troyce@bio.tamu.edu (Troyce) writes:

|
|> What I'd like to know, is what IS incentive licensing, and how it was
|> different from the previous method, and how it's different from what we
|> have now.

Incentive licensing is what we have today. The idea behind it was that
the more you learned and excelled in amateur radio via theory and code
tests, the more frequency spectrum you received to operate on (hence,
the "incentive" to upgrade.)

This really doesn't differ all that much from what we have today, except
certain elements in amateur radio would like to remove the "work" aspect
towards gaining additional spectrum, and instead have you place an 'X' on
a form from the FCC and get all spectrum with no work.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- RI Center For Political Incorrectness & Environment Ignorance
-- 'Have you hugged your chainsaw today?'

Date: Tue, 29 Mar 1994 22:48:06 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!
yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!world!drt@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Incentive Licensing
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Troyce (Troyce@bio.tamu.edu) wrote:

: I have a question. I've read many comments over the past several months
: about "incentive licensing" and how it has affected amateur radio. I
: gather that this was a concept that was introduced in the 60's or 70's.
: What I'd like to know, is what IS incentive licensing, and how it was
: different from the previous method, and how it's different from what we
: have now.

"Incentive licensing" is the current licensing system, the most
complicated in the world, now with 6 separate tiers of license, many
of which add only very small slivers of "choice" HF spectrum. Most
other countries seem to have from three all the way down to one class,
frequently with "no-code" and "code" (usu. about 12 wpm) versions.
They can do this because most countries don't have mandated subbands
for phone/cw/data, and they realize that if you are technically
qualified to handle an SSB transmitter with linear on 14.300, there's

no reason to keep you from operating that rig on any other amateur frequency.

As an example, Canada's "Basic" seems about as hard as 2, 3A, and 3B put together, and their "Advanced" adds something akin to 4A. Both are available in no-code, 5 wpm, and 12 wpm flavors. Barbados, on the other hand, has just one license.

If hams are opinionated porcupines, "incentive licensing" is one of those topics that stimulates their instinct to brandish their opinion quills ("Ah! Complicated, yet pointless"). And if I know this group, an alternative point of view will be posted soon.

-drt

David R. Tucker KG2S 8P9CL drt@world.std.com

Date: 30 Mar 94 18:52:44 GMT
From: agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!natinst.com!
news.dell.com!swrinde!sgiblab!sgigate.sgi.com!olivea!korie!male.EBay.Sun.COM!
exodus.Eng.Sun.COM!engnews2.Eng.
Subject: Incentive Licensing
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2namg1\$svk@agate.berkeley.edu> kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU (Ken A. Nishimura) writes:

>choice spectrum of the future, UHF and beyond. Note now
>that we are giving away the entire amateur band above 50
>MHz to the no-clues... I say no clues not because of code,
>but because many don't have the knowledge to "advance the
>art" as stated in Part 97.1(c).
>
>Before I get singed from flames,

If you really wanted to avoid that, you could avoid the inflammatory term "no-clue".

> I'm not saying that we have to
>make *all* the tests harder, but that there should be some
>spectrum reserved for those who demonstrate that they have
>the knowledge to "advance the art of radio".

You're solving a problem that doesn't exist. As a practical matter, 900 MHz and everything from 2.3GHz and up is reserved to the technically knowledgeable since there's no just-push-talk commercial equipment available. What value is added by putting on legal restrictions?

>

>But for VHF and beyond, we need a new metric for proficiency.
>Let those that want to experiment with ham radio and play at
>the level of today's no-code tech

How about at the level of today's coded tech?

>Those that want to really experiment and can demonstrate their
>knowledge on a REAL exam should be granted access to another
>sliver of spectrum where new methods of radio communication can be
>toyed with.

But they already have that (indeed, far more than a sliver.) The only thing your proposal would add is a certificate so some people could feel that they are government-certified superior human beings. Sorry, I don't want my government doing that.

>Of course, we don't want to end up with 2 zillion license classes,
>so.... Let's roll novice and tech together. Really, passing
>3A after 2 isn't THAT hard is it?

Is if you're in 6th grade and not a super-genius.

>General and Advanced could be
>rolled into one also. Look at the licensing stats, hardly anyone
>goes for general. It seems that anyone who is willing to spend
>the effort to get 1B can study and get 4A instead of 3B.

Well, that's what I did, but I hardly think that only people who have that level of knowledge *going in* should be allowed to work voice or PacTOR below 28MHz, or any mode at all on 20 meters. I think we have to make room for the people who just want to operate, as well as us tech weenies.

Rich

--

Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

Date: 31 Mar 94 03:11:10 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!
usenet@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: Incentive Licensing
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

When hams talk about "incentive licensing," they are usually referring to a rule making proceeding that lasted from 1963 to 1967 and which generated very strong emotions.

Date: 29 Mar 1994 17:38:44 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!
charnel.net.csuchico.edu!charnel!olivea!korie1!news2me.EBay.Sun.COM!
exodus.Eng.Sun.COM!engnews2.Eng.Sun.COM!engnews2!rfm@network.
Subject: Incentive Licensing (
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Mar29.163213.7203@cs.brown.edu> md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>This really doesn't differ all that much from what we have today, except
>certain elements in amateur radio would like to remove the "work" aspect
>towards gaining additional spectrum, and instead have you place an 'X' on
>a form from the FCC and get all spectrum with no work.

This is still a straw man, Michael. Find me somebody who says this.

Besides, didn't you say the reason for incentive licensing was so the ARRL could sell more license-preparation books?

Rich

--

Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

Date: 28 Mar 1994 17:55:37 GMT
From: korie1!male.EBay.Sun.COM!exodus.Eng.Sun.COM!engnews2.Eng.Sun.COM!engnews2!
rfm@ames.arpa
Subject: Morse Whiners
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CnCE9y.BAz@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>If you believe learning code is a waste of time, then you probably see
>no worth in learning to play a musical instrument or teaching oneself
>art or studying a foreign language, none of which might help you get
>get a job.

Are you trying for the Michael Daignan straw man award? Never have I said
that skill acquisition in general is a bad thing, or unrewarding. I merely
object to you choosing the skill for me, and using the government to enforce
your choice.

>
>Pushing buttons on a computer doesn't prepare one to do very much, unless
>your life ambition is to push buttons; seems rather boring to me.

You sure seem to spend a lot of time doing it... if you don't enjoy it,
why not stop?

Rich

--
Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

Date: 30 Mar 94 20:31:24 GMT
From: unix.sri.com!headwall.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!
paulf@hplabs.hp.com
Subject: Morse Whiners
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Marc.T..Kaufman@f40.n382.z1.fidonet.org (Marc T. Kaufman) writes:

>Even SAC shut down GiantTalk.

News to me, since I was listening to the GT primary yesterday, and it seemed
as active as usual. Of course, SAC doesn't really exist anymore...

--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: 30 Mar 94 21:52:15 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU!kennish@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CnG7C7.13C@world.std.com>, <2namg1\$svk@agate.berkeley.edu>,
<1994Mar30.200033.29496@enterprise.rdd.lmsc.lockheed.com>
Subject : Re: Incentive Licensing

In article <1994Mar30.200033.29496@enterprise.rdd.lmsc.lockheed.com>,
George Lyle (233789) <glyle@marie.seas.ucla.edu> wrote:
><article concerning reserving HF and VHF spectrum to those
>who could pass rigorous technical exam omitted due to length>

Thank you.

>I would tend to agree with more rigorous exams. Some of the
>multiple choice tests are getting pretty easy.

Well, I think that the supposedly difficult exams are getting
easy. I think that a relatively easy entry level exam is
appropriate.

>I question if it is possible to measure an applicant's ability
>to "advance the radio art" with any exam. I know a young computer
>hacker who has written some very elegant repeater control software.
>This software has definately "advanced the art", yet its writer
>is only a "no-code" tech. I was over to his house the other day
>and taught him how to install BNC connectors on coax. He is not
>terribly interested in RF design, so he probably would not pass a
>technical exam such as the one proposed.
>
>The point here is that radio is such a multi-faceted subject that
>it is possible to be a "guru" in one area and totally ignorant
>in another. Who is to judge which area is more important?
>

Yes, this is a problem, and I guess can be applied to the code
vs. no-code argument. (CW ability is a very narrow part of
radio operation and engineering.) Compromise and breadth
is what is required. I believe that people who are really interested
in advancing the art who may be lacking in knowledge will have
the self-discipline to learn new areas of the hobby. Remember,
we aren't talking "rocket-scientist" level, but something
a bit more substantial than memorize the answer.
Also if you REALLY hate a certain aspect
of radio engineering, you can shank those questions. Nobody
is asking for a 100% to pass.....

-Ken

Date: Tue, 29 Mar 94 20:38:12 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!mvp.saic.com!news.cerf.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!
noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <mp3fntINNk13@news.bbn.com>, <5i5Np6h.edellers@delphi.com>,
<1994Mar28.032552.3146@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>
Subject : Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters

Mr. Nice Guy <rcanders@nyx10.cs.du.edu> writes:

>You are changing the subject, you may be free to use the frequency but
>not anyone elses repeater. You _may_ have a right to operate simplex on
>the repeater input but that does not give you a right to use the repeater.

I'm not changing the subject -- I'm pointing out a different aspect of it.

Either I am authorized to transmit on the repeater's input frequency (if it is clear), even in ways which might activate that repeater, with no recourse available to the repeater licensee, or the repeater trustee has the right to prevent (not just deter) me from using the repeater. 97.205(e) - "Limiting the use of a repeater to only certain user stations is permissible" -- would appear to imply the latter.

If a lid cannot be ordered to stay off a repeater which does not use conditional-access systems, how can it be a violation to add tones to activate a repeater (or its ancillary functions)? In BOTH cases the "offending" operator is acting against the wishes of the repeater licensee, but in BOTH cases the user is ONLY transmitting a signal, on a frequency previously found to be clear.

Date: 30 Mar 94 20:37:12 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU!kennish@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CnG7C7.13C@world.std.com>, <2namg1\$svk@agate.berkeley.edu>,
<RFM.94Mar30105244@urth.eng.sun.com>
Subject : Re: Incentive Licensing

In article <RFM.94Mar30105244@urth.eng.sun.com>,
Richard McAllister <rfm@urth.eng.sun.com> wrote:
>You're solving a problem that doesn't exist. As a practical matter,
>900 MHz and everything from 2.3GHz and up is reserved to the technically

>knowledgeable since there's no just-push-talk commercial equipment
>available. What value is added by putting on legal restrictions?

That may be true today, but what about tomorrow? There are a growing number of 1.2 GHz mobiles and now even a tri-band HT. What is going to prevent 1.2 GHz from turning into 2m? Eventually, the equipment will be there and the price will be reasonable, the same with 2.4 GHz and beyond. It's the same as computers -- faster the for same price as time goes on, except that we get higher RF carriers for the same price as time goes on....

>>But for VHF and beyond, we need a new metric for proficiency.
>>Let those that want to experiment with ham radio and play at
>>the level of today's no-code tech (remainder of paragraph needed
for full context...)

>

>How about at the level of today's coded tech?

Well, seeing that code vs. no-code tech has the same written exam, they are interchangeable in the above paragraph. (what's your point?)

>But they already have that (indeed, far more than a sliver.) The
>only thing your proposal would add is a certificate
>so some people could feel that they are government-certified superior
>human beings. Sorry, I don't want my government doing that.

Well, see my first response. NOW they have more than a sliver, but what about tomorrow? There are those that want to experiment with RF frequencies where equipment is available and cheap. Sure, today's experimenters can go to 60 GHz, but it's too expensive. Experimentation should be encouraged where components and equipment is readily available.

I take it that you are against incentive licensing period then. I really don't see any difference in the government certifying that one knows radio engineering vs. knowing morse code. Are you against any form of knowledge based segregation? You are implying that by filling out a form, you want access to all ham frequencies... That's a different thread here....

>>Of course, we don't want to end up with 2 zillion license classes,
>>so.... Let's roll novice and tech together. Really, passing
>>3A after 2 isn't THAT hard is it?

>

>Is if you're in 6th grade and not a super-genius.

>

I actually think 2 is harder than 3A, with all the rules and regs.
Face it, large numbers of people pass both 2 and 3A by rote memory....

>>General and Advanced could be

>>rolled into one also. Look at the licensing stats, hardly anyone
>>goes for general. It seems that anyone who is willing to spend
>>the effort to get 1B can study and get 4A instead of 3B.
>
>Well, that's what I did, but I hardly think that only people who have that
>level of knowledge *going in* should be allowed to work voice or PacTOR
>below 28MHz, or any mode at all on 20 meters. I think we have to make room
>for the people who just want to operate, as well as us tech weenies.

OK, if you want it, then get rid of 4A and give people who pass 3B the
spectrum for 4A. I don't care, since i'm more interested in preserving
the VHF and beyond range. Besides, I don't think that the added
HF spectrum is that big of a carrot.

>
>Rich
>--
>Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

Folks -- I may have mis-written what I intended by intertwining the
Extra license with what I propose. I implied that to get the so called
experimenter's band, one had to know code. I don't care about code
in VHF+ since it's not important to advancing the art of radio in these
bands (save EME, auroral prop, etc., weak signal.)

In retrospect, maybe all I want to see is an area of spectrum where
the commonly available emission types are prohibited (e.g. A3E, J3E, F3E,
A1A, G3E, F3A, F2A, etc.) That would serve my purposes also, in that
you wouldn't be able to use your HT to talk through a repeater in that
band or use simplex voice.

Keep in mind that I am not trying to usurp large portions of spectra.
I spend 98% of my time ragchewing myself, so I want large portions of
spectrum available for that, but I want some reserved for non-conventional
communications.

-Ken

Date: 28 Mar 1994 17:34 CST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!
news.uh.edu!rosie.uh.edu!st3qi@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Cn1Jys.28z@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <22MAR199406565240@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>,
<032894004025Rnf0.77b8@amcomp.com>
Subject : Re: Rich has flipped out (was: Morse Whiners)

In article <032894004025Rnf0.77b8@amcomp.com>, dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes...

>Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:

>>No, that is NOT the moral at all. The code test is an ARTIFICIAL requirement
>>imposed by bureaucrats at the FCC; it has nothing to do with working to
>>produce something of value to others in order to earn a reward from them.

>

>Not the FCC. The HAMS! The FCC wants to drop the code tests (IMHO).

>

>Dan N8PKV

>

I beg to differ. Read the back of a current Form 610.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #155
